arXiv:1609.02209v1 [math.CO] 7 Sep 2016

A lower bound on the spectrum of unimodular networks

Mustazee Rahman

Abstract

Unimodular networks are stochastic generalizations of finite graphs. We prove a lower bound on the spectral radius of both the adjacency and random walk operator of a unimodular network in terms of its average degree. Using this we prove an Alon-Boppana type bound for the largest eigenvalues in absolute value of large, connected, bounded degree graphs. We also provide a lower bound on the volume growth rate of a unimodular tree in terms of its average degree.

1 Introduction

The Alon-Boppana Theorem [14] states that if G_n is a sequence of finite connected d-regular graphs with $|G_n| \to \infty$ then the second largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of G_n in absolute value, say $\sigma_2(G_n)$, satisfies $\liminf_n \sigma_2(G_n) \geq 2\sqrt{d-1}$. The quantity $2\sqrt{d-1}$ is the spectral radius of the d-regular tree, which is the exponential growth rate of the number of closed walks in the d-regular tree around a fixed vertex. A stronger version of the Alon-Boppana Theorem due to Serre [15] states that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $c(\epsilon, d)$ such that any finite d-regular graph has at least $c(\epsilon, d)$-proportion of its eigenvalues having absolute value larger than $2\sqrt{d-1} - \epsilon$.

What can be said about these types of spectral lower bounds for non-regular or even infinite graphs? We provide such bounds for unimodular networks, a stochastic generalization of finite graphs. Using the framework of local convergence of graphs this provides lower bounds to the top eigenvalues in absolute value of bounded degree finite graphs in terms of their average degree. Before stating the results we begin with some background.

Greenberg [9] extended the aforementioned theorem of Serre to finite graphs, showing the following. Let G be a connected graph on a countable number of vertices that is locally finite in that every vertex has finite degree. Let $W_k(G, x)$ be the set of closed walks in G of length k from a vertex x. The spectral radius of G is

$$\rho(G) = \lim_{k\to\infty} |W_{2k}(G, x)|^{\frac{1}{2k}}.$$

The limit exists and does not depend on x. Greenberg proved that for any tree T and any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $c(\epsilon, T) > 0$ such that if a finite graph G has universal cover T then at least $c(\epsilon, T)$-proportion of its eigenvalues have absolute value at least $\rho(T) - \epsilon$. (See also [12] where the result is stated.) Various strengthening of the Alon-Boppana Theorem for non-regular graphs has also been proved by Cioabă [6] and Mohar [13].

Following Greenberg's Theorem, Hoory [10] proved that if G is a finite graph with m edges that is not a tree and T is its universal cover then $\rho(T) \geq 2\sqrt{\Lambda}$, where $\Lambda = \prod_{v\in G}(\deg(v) - 1)^{\deg(v)/2m}$. It can be

Author's research is partially supported by an NSERC PDF award.
Keywords: Alon-Boppana Theorem, spectral graph theory, unimodular network

shown that $\Lambda \geq 2\sqrt{d_{\rm av}(G)-1}$, where $d_{\rm av}(G)$ is the average degree of G. Combining Greenberg's Theorem with Hoory's implies that the set of finite connected graphs sharing a common universal cover T have the property that for any $\epsilon > 0$, any graph G from this set has at least $c(\epsilon, T)|G|$ eigenvalues with absolute value at least $2\sqrt{d_{\rm av}(G)-1} - \epsilon$.

Sharing a common universal cover is a form of spatial homogeneity for graphs. Indeed, if two finite graphs have a common universal cover then they also have a common finite cover [11]. This implies for instance that both graphs have the same spectral radius, average degree, and even the same degree distribution. Now, in order to prove Alon-Boppana type bounds it is necessary to have some form of spatial homogeneity. For example, if the complete graph on n-vertices is glued to a path of length n at a common vertex then the average degree of the resulting graph is at least $n/2$ while all but the largest eigenvalues have absolute value at most 2. We replace the condition of having a common universal cover with a stochastic form of spatial homogeneity that requires that the graphs look homogenous around most vertices.

The stochastic spatial homogeneity that we consider uses the notions of **unimodular networks** and **local weak convergence** of graphs. Roughly speaking, a unimodular network is a random rooted graph, possibly infinite, that is homogeneous in a sense that shifting the root to its neighbour does not change the distribution of the graph; Section 1.1 contains the definition. Finite connected graphs with a uniform random choice of root are unimodular. Unimodular networks encompass a large class of graphs that arise in combinatorics and probability theory. See [2] for a thorough discussion and references.

Under natural assumptions we show that the spectral radius of a unimodular network is at least $2\sqrt{d_{\rm av}-1}$, where $d_{\rm av}$ is the expected degree of the root. We prove a similar lower bound for the spectral radius of the simple random walk. Using the notion of local weak convergence of unimodular networks we then prove that a convergent sequence of bounded degree unimodular networks have uniformly positive mass near the spectral radius of the universal cover of the limit. This provides an analogue of Greenberg's Theorem for unimodular networks.

We use these results to derive Alon-Boppana-type bounds for the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix and simple random walk (or Markov) operator of any growing sequence of connected bounded degree graphs. For the adjacency matrix we show that if G_n is a sequence of finite connected bounded degree graphs with size $|G_n| \to \infty$ then the j-th largest eigenvalue of G_n in absolute value, say $\sigma_j(G_n)$, satisfies $\liminf_n \sigma_j(G_n) \geq \liminf_n 2\sqrt{d_{\rm av}(G_n)-1}$. A related Cheeger bound for such graph sequences has been proved by Elek [8].

Finally, we show that the volume growth rate of a unimodular tree with no leaves is at least $d_{\rm av} - 1$, where $d_{\rm av}$ is the expected degree of the root. The volume growth rate of the universal cover tree of a graph is related to the spectral radius of the non-backtracking walk operator of the graph [3].

1.1 Unimodular networks

A rooted graph (G, x) is a graph G with a distinguished vertex x called the root. Two rooted graphs are isomorphic if there is a graph isomorphism between them that maps the root of one graph to the root of the other. Let $\mathcal{G}^*$ denote the set of isomorphism classes of rooted graphs on a countable number of vertices that are connected and locally finite. Essentially, $\mathcal{G}^*$ consists of rooted unlabelled graphs. For $(G, x), (H, y) \in \mathcal{G}^*$, their distance is defined to be $1/(1+R)$ where $R = \min\{r : B_r(G, x) \cong B_r(H, y)\}$ and $B_r(G, x)$ is the r-neighbourhood of x in G. Under this distance $\mathcal{G}^*$ is a complete separable metric space. A random rooted graph is a Borel probability measure ν on $\mathcal{G}^*$. The space of such probability measures is given the topology of weak convergence: $\nu_n \to \nu$ if $\int f \, d\nu_n \to \int f \, d\nu$ for every bounded and continuous $f : \mathcal{G}^* \to \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\mathcal{G}^{**}$ be the set of isomorphism classes of doubly rooted graphs (G, x, y) that are countable, connected and locally finite. Let ν be a Borel probability measure on $\mathcal{G}^*$ and denote by $(G, \circ)$ a $\mathcal{G}^*$-valued random variable with law ν. The random rooted graph $(G, \circ)$ is a **unimodular network** if for every $f : \mathcal{G}^{**} \to [0, \infty]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x \in V(G)} f(G, \circ, x)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x \in V(G)} f(G, x, \circ)\right]. \tag{1.1}$$

Equation (1.1) is called the Mass-Transport Principle. To verify unimodularity it actually suffices that the Mass-Transport Principle holds for functions f that satisfy $f(G, x, y) = 0$ if x and y are not neighbours in G [2, Proposition 2.2].

A sequence of unimodular networks $(G_n, \circ_n)$ converges to $(G, \circ)$ if the law of the random rooted graphs $(G_n, \circ_n)$ converges to the law of $(G, \circ)$ in the topology of weak convergence. The limit $(G, \circ)$ is unimodular as the Mass-Transport Principle for $(G, \circ)$ can be verified using a standard approximation argument [5, Lemma 2.1]. This notion of convergence of unimodular networks, especially for finite graphs, is called **local weak convergence** or sometimes also Benjamini-Schramm convergence as they formulated the concept [4].

The following are some examples of unimodular networks. If G is a finite connected graph and $\circ$ is a uniform random vertex of G then $(G, \circ)$ is unimodular. The Cayley graph of any finitely generated group, rooted at the identity, is a deterministic unimodular network. Examples of unimodular trees include periodic trees, Poisson-Galton-Watson trees, and more generally, unimodular Galton-Watson trees [2, Examples 1.1 and 10.2]. The latter are local weak limits of random graphs with a given degree sequence.

Recall that $W_k(G, x)$ is the set of closed walks in G of length k starting from x. The **spectral radius** of a unimodular network $(G, \circ)$ is defined as

$$\rho(G) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\, |W_{2k}(G, \circ)| \,\right]^{\frac{1}{2k}}.$$

The quantity $\mathbb{E}\left[|W_k(G, \circ)|\right]$ can be realized as the k-th moment of a Borel probability measure of $\mathbb{R}$ called the spectral measure of $(G, \circ)$, as explained in Section 2. The spectral radius is then the largest element in absolute value in the support of the spectral measure. If G is a finite graph then its spectral measure is the empirical measure of the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix.

Similarly, we can define the spectral measure and spectral radius of the simple random walk (SRW) on $(G, \circ)$. For $(G, x) \in \mathcal{G}^*$, let $p_k(G, x)$ be the k-step return probability of the SRW on (G, x) started from x. The spectral radius of the SRW on a unimodular network $(G, \circ)$ is

$$\rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(G) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[p_{2k}(G, \circ)\right]^{\frac{1}{2k}}.$$

Let T_G denote the **universal cover** tree of a connected, locally finite graph G. This is the unique tree for which there is a subjective graph homomorphism $\pi : T_G \to G$, called the cover map, such that π is a isomorphism when restricted to the neighbourhood of every vertex. For $(G, x) \in \mathcal{G}^*$, let $(T_G, \hat{x})$ be its universal cover rooted at any $\hat{x}$ that is mapped to x by the cover map (all such $(T_G, \hat{x})$ have the same rooted isomorphism class). The cover map sends closed walks in T_G from $\hat{x}$ to closed walks in G from x in an injective manner; therefore, $\rho(G) \geq \rho(T_G)$. The SRW on (G, x) is the projection of the SRW on $(T_G, \hat{x})$ under the cover map; therefore, $\rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(G) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T_G)$. If $(G, \circ)$ is a unimodular network then its universal cover tree $(T_G, \hat{\circ})$ is also unimodular. Here, $(T_G, \hat{\circ})$ is constructed for every sample outcome of $(G, \circ)$.

1.2 Main results

Theorem 1. *Let $(T,\circ)$ be a unimodular tree with $\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]<\infty$ and having no leaves almost surely. Then*

$$\rho(T)\geq 2\,\exp\left\{\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\log(\sqrt{\deg(\circ)-1})\right]}{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]}\right\}\geq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]-1}\,.$$

Additionally, if $(T,\circ)$ has deterministically bounded degree then

$$\rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T)\geq 2\,\exp\left\{\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{\deg(\circ)-1}}{\deg(\circ)}\right)\right]}{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]}\right\}\geq\frac{2\,\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]\,\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]-1}}{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)^2]}.$$

Theorem 2. *The following bounds hold for the spectra of unimodular networks and finite graphs.*

I) Let $(G_n,\circ)$ be a sequence of unimodular networks such that $\sup_n\rho(G_n)=:\Delta<\infty$. Suppose that $(G_n,\circ)\to(G,\circ)$ in the local weak topology. Let $(T_G,\circ)$ denote the universal cover of $(G,\circ)$. Let μ_n denote the spectral measure of $(G_n,\circ)$ and let μ_{T_G} denote it for $(T_G,\circ)$. For every $\epsilon>0$ there exists $c(\epsilon,\Delta,\mu_{T_G})>0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\mu_n\left(\{|x|>\rho(T_G)-\epsilon\}\right)\geq c(\epsilon,\Delta,\mu_{T_G}).$$

II) Let $\sigma_j(G)$ denote the j-th largest eigenvalue in absolute value and counted with multiplicity of the adjacency matrix of a finite graph G (also known as the singular values of G). Let $d_{\mathrm{av}}(G)$ denote the average degree of G. If G_n is a sequence of finite connected graphs with vertex degrees bounded by Δ and $|G_n|\to\infty$ then for every $j\geq 1$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sigma_j(G_n)\geq\liminf_{n\to\infty}2\sqrt{d_{\mathrm{av}}(G_n)-1}\,.$$

III) Let μ_G^{SRW} denote the empirical measure of the eigenvalues of the Markov operator of a graph G, that is, the matrix P with entries $P(x,y)=\frac{1}{\deg x}\mathbf{1}_{\{x\sim y\}}$ for $x,y\in V(G_n)$. If G_n is a sequence of finite connected graphs with no leaves and all vertex degrees at most Δ, then for any $\epsilon>0$ we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\mu_{G_n}^{\mathrm{SRW}}\left(\left\{|x|>\frac{2\,d_{\mathrm{av}}(G_n)\sqrt{d_{\mathrm{av}}(G_n)-1}}{\frac{1}{|G_n|}\sum_{x\in G_n}(\deg x)^2}-\epsilon\right\}\right)>0.$$

Theorem 3. *Let $(T,\circ)$ be a unimodular tree with $\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]<\infty$ and having no leaves almost surely. Let $S_r(T,\circ)=\{x\in V(T):\mathrm{dist}_T(o,x)=r\}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|S_r(T,\circ)|\right]&\geq\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]\cdot\exp\left\{(r-1)\frac{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)\,\log(\deg(\circ)-1)]}{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]}\right\}\\&\geq\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]\,(\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]-1)^{r-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Outline of paper Section 2 contains a discussion of concepts used in the proofs. Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 are proved in Sections 3, 4 and 5, respectively. The proof idea of Theorems 1 and 3 is borrowed from Hoory [10]. It is based on counting walks in a unimodular tree according to their height function. In order to count the number of walks with a given height function we use an entropy argument that provides a lower bound in terms of the entropy of the non-backtracking walk on the tree. Theorem

2 uses key features of the local weak topology, in particular, compactness of bounded degree unimodular networks and continuity of the map taking a unimodular network to its spectral measure.

2 Preliminaries

Spectrum of a unimodular network For a unimodular network $(G,\circ)$ the quantity $\mathbb{E}\left[|W_k(G,\circ)|\right]$ can be realized as the k-th moment of a Borel probability measure μ_G on $\mathbb{R}$ called its **spectral measure**. The theory of von Neumann Algebras is used to define μ_G (see [5, Section 2.3] or [2, Section 5]). We have that $\mu_G(B) = \mathbb{E}_{(G,\circ)}\left[\mu_{A_G}^{\delta_\circ}(B)\right]$, where $\mu_{A_G}^{\delta_\circ}$ is the spectral measure at the function $\delta_\circ$ of the adjacency operator of G acting on $\ell^2(G)$. The spectral radius of $(G,\circ)$ can be formulated in terms of the spectral measure: $\rho(G) = \sup\{|x| : x \in \text{support}(\mu_G)\}$. The spectral measure μ_G^{SRW} and radius $\rho_{\text{SRW}}(G)$ of the SRW on $(G,\circ)$ are defined similarly with respect to the Markov operator acting on $\ell^2(G)$. The probability measure μ_G^{SRW} is supported inside the interval $[-1,1]$; thus, $\rho_{\text{SRW}}(G) \le 1$. Moreover, the moments of μ_G^{SRW} are $\int x^k \, d\mu_G^{\text{SRW}} = \mathbb{E}\left[p_k(G,\circ)\right]$.

If a sequence of unimodular networks $(G_n,\circ)$ converges to $(G,\circ)$ in the local weak limit then their spectral measures $\mu_{G_n} \to \mu_G$ in the weak topology [5, Proposition 2.2]. In particular, if $\sup_n \rho(G_n) < \infty$ then $\mathbb{E}\left[|W_k(G_n,\circ)|\right] \to \mathbb{E}\left[|W_k(G,\circ)|\right]$ for every k. Similarly, $\mu_{G_n}^{\text{SRW}} \to \mu_G^{\text{SRW}}$ weakly and we have that $\mathbb{E}\left[p_k(G_n,\circ)\right] \to \mathbb{E}\left[p_k(G,\circ)\right]$ for every k because the functions $x \to x^k$ are bounded continuous on $[-1,1]$.

Edge rooted graphs and non-backtracking walk The non-backtracking walk (NBW) is a Markov process on the space of directed edge rooted graphs with no leaves, namely, the subset of $\mathcal{G}^{**}$ consisting of graphs rooted at one of its edges and every vertex of the graph having degree at least 2. For $(G,x,y) \in \mathcal{G}^{**}$ with $(x,y) \in E(G)$, let $e = (x,y), e^- = x, e^+ = y$ and $\overleftarrow{e} = (y,x)$. One step of the non-backtracking walk gives a random element $(G,e^+,z) \in \mathcal{G}^{**}$, where z is a uniform random neighbor of e^+ that is different from e^-. Let $\text{NBW}(G,e)$ denote the outcome of one step of the NBW starting from $(G,e) = (G,x,y)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\text{NBW}(G,e) = (H,f)\right] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\deg(e^+)-1} & \text{if } (H,f) = (G,e^+,z) \text{ for } z \in B_1(G,e^+) \setminus \{e^-\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now define the NBW on a unimodular network $(G,\circ)$ with $\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right] < \infty$ and having no leaves almost surely. First, we define a random edge rooted network $(G,\circ,\circ')$ *derived from* $(G,\circ)$. $(G,\circ,\circ')$ is a Borel measurable random variable taking values in $\mathcal{G}^{**}$ with its law stipulated as follows. For every bounded measurable $f : \mathcal{G}^{**} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(G,\circ,\circ')\right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x:x\sim\circ} f(G,\circ,x)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]}. \tag{2.1}$$

The NBW on $(G,\circ)$ is the $\mathcal{G}^{**}$-valued process $(G_0,e_0),(G_1,e_1),\ldots$ defined by $(G_0,e_0) = (G,\circ,\circ')$ and $(G_n,e_n) = \text{NBW}(G_{n-1},e_{n-1})$. The network $(G,\circ,\circ')$ can roughly be thought of as choosing the root of G according to a degree bias from the distribution of $(G,\circ)$ and then choosing $\circ'$ as a uniform random neighbour of $\circ$. If $(G,\circ)$ is a fixed finite graph with a uniform random root $\circ$ then $(G,\circ,\circ')$ is rooted at a uniform random directed edge of G.

Also, for a random edge rooted network $(G,e) = (G,e^-,e^+) \in \mathcal{G}^{**}$ we define its **reversal** $(G,\overleftarrow{e})$ as the

random edge rooted network whose law satisfies the following for all bounded measurable $f : \mathcal{G}^{**} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(G, \overleftarrow{e})\right] = \mathbb{E}_{(G,e)}\left[f(G, e^+, e^-)\right].$$

Lemma 4 (Stationarity of NBW)**.** *Let $(G, \circ)$ be a unimodular network having no leaves almost surely and satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)] < \infty$. Let $(G_0, e_0) = (G, \circ, \circ'), (G_1, e_1), \ldots$ be the NBW on $(G, \circ)$. Then the reversal $(G, \overleftarrow{e}_0)$ has the same law as (G, e_0) and each (G_n, e_n) has the same law as (G_0, e_0).*

Proof. If $f : \mathcal{G}^{**} \to [0, \infty)$ is measurable then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(G_0, \overleftarrow{e}_0)\right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x:x\sim\circ} f(G, x, \circ)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x:x\sim\circ} f(G, \circ, x)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} = \mathbb{E}\left[f(G_0, e_0\right],$$

where the second equality uses unimodularity. This shows that $(G_0, \overleftarrow{e}_0)$ has the same law as (G_0, e_0). For the second claim it suffices to show that (G_1, e_1) has the same law as (G_0, e_0). For f as above we see from the definition of a NBW step that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[f(G_1, e_1)\right] &= \mathbb{E}_{(G_0,e_0)}\left[\frac{1}{\deg(e_0^+) - 1} \times \sum_{z\sim e_0^+, z\neq e_0^-} f(G_0, e_0^+, z)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{(G,\circ,\circ')}\left[\sum_{z\sim\circ',\, z\neq\circ} \frac{f(G, \circ', z)}{\deg(\circ') - 1}\right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{(G,\circ)}\left[\sum_{x:x\sim\circ}\sum_{z\sim x, z\neq\circ} \frac{f(G,x,z)}{\deg(x)-1}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{(G,\circ)}\left[\sum_{x,z\in V(G)} \frac{f(G,x,z)}{\deg(x)-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{z\neq\circ, x\sim z, x\sim\circ\}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]}. \qquad (2.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the function $F : \mathcal{G}^{**} \to [0, \infty)$ defined by $F(G, y, z) = \sum_{x\in V(G)} \frac{f(G,x,z)}{\deg(x)-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{z\neq y, x\sim z, x\sim y\}}$, which is isomorphism invariant. Applying the Mass-Transport Principle (1.1) to F gives $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{z\in V(G)} F(\circ, z)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{z\in V(G)} F(z, \circ)\right]$. The first expectation gives the numerator of (2.2) and the second expectation equals $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x,z\in V(G)} \frac{f(G,x,\circ)}{\deg(x)-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{z\neq\circ, x\sim\circ, x\sim z\}}\right]$. Observe that

$$\sum_{x,z\in V(G)} \frac{f(G, x, \circ)}{\deg(x) - 1}\mathbf{1}_{\{z\neq\circ, x\sim\circ, x\sim z\}} = \sum_{x\in V(G)} \frac{f(G, x, \circ)}{\deg(x) - 1} \sum_{z\in V(G)} \mathbf{1}_{\{z\neq\circ, x\sim\circ, x\sim z\}} = \sum_{x:x\sim\circ} f(G, x, \circ).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right] \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[f(G_1, e_1)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x:x\sim\circ} f(G, x, \circ)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x:x\sim\circ} f(G, \circ, x)\right].$$

The last equality is due to unimodularity as well. This shows that $\mathbb{E}\left[f(G_1, e_1)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[f(G_0, e_0)\right]$. □

Entropy We mention some concepts of Kolmogorov-Shannon entropy that we will use; for a reference see [7]. Let X be a random variable with values in a countable state space Ω. If $p(x)$ is the probability density

of X then with the convention that $0 \log 0 = 0$ the entropy of X is defined as

$$H[X] = \sum_{x \in \Omega} -p(x) \log p(x) = \mathbb{E}_X \left[-\log p(X) \right].$$

Let (X, Y) be jointly distributed on Ω^2 and let $p(y|x)$ be the conditional density of Y given $\{X = x\}$ with the convention that $p(y|x) \equiv 0$ if $p(x) = 0$. The conditional entropy of Y given X is

$$H[Y|X] = \mathbb{E}_X \left[\sum_{y \in \Omega} -p(y|X) \log p(y|X) \right].$$

If $H[X, Y]$ and $H[X]$ are both finite then $H[Y|X] = H[X, Y] - H[X]$. If Y is measurable with respect to X then $H[Y|X] = 0$. If (X, Y, Z) are jointly distributed such that Y is conditionally independent of Z given X then $H[Y|X, Z] = H[Y|X]$. If $(X_0, \ldots, X_n)$ are jointly distributed then the chain rule of entropy states

$$H[X_0, \ldots, X_n] = H[X_0] + H[X_1|X_0] + H[X_2|X_1, X_0] + \cdots + H[X_n|X_{n-1}, \ldots, X_0].$$

Entropy of the NBW If $(G, x, y) \in \mathcal{G}^{**}$ is edge rooted with no leaves then $H[\mathrm{NBW}(G, x, y) \mid (G, x, y)] = \log(\deg(y) - 1)$. From this we see that if $(G, \circ, \circ')$ is any random edge rooted graph with no leaves then $H[\mathrm{NBW}(G, \circ, \circ') \mid (G, \circ, \circ')] = \mathbb{E}\left[\log(\deg(\circ') - 1)\right]$. In particular, if $(G, \circ, \circ')$ is derived from a unimodular network $(G, \circ)$ via (2.1) then the edge reversal invariance of $(G, \circ, \circ')$ from Lemma 4 applied to $\mathbb{E}\left[\log(\deg(\circ') - 1)\right]$ gives the entropy of a NBW step on a unimodular network:

$$H[\mathrm{NBW}(G, \circ, \circ') \mid (G, \circ, \circ')] = \mathbb{E}_{(G, \circ, \circ')}\left[\log(\deg(\circ) - 1)\right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ) \log(\deg(\circ) - 1)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]}. \tag{2.3}$$

3 Spectral radius of unimodular trees

In order to prove Theorem 1 we will consider unimodular networks with edge weights and bound the expectation of weighted closed walks. By choosing appropriate weights we will deduce both statements in Theorem 1. Let $(T, x) \in \mathcal{G}^*$ be a tree. Let $w \in W_{2k}(T, x)$ and let the sequence of vertices visited by w be denoted $w_0 = x, w_1, \ldots, w_{2k} = x$. Let $e_j = (w_{j-1}, w_j)$. The **height profile** of w is the function $h_w : \{0, 1, \ldots, 2k\} \to \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ defined by $h_w(j) = \mathrm{dist}_T(x, w_j)$. The height profile is a Dyck path of length $2k$. The **forward steps** of w is the sequence of k directed edges $e_{j_1}, \ldots, e_{j_k}$ for which $h_w(j_i) - h_w(j_i - 1) = 1$, and such a j_i is a **forward time**. The walk w is uniquely determined by its height profile and forward steps.

Let $c : \mathcal{G}^{**} \to [0, \infty)$ be a weight function such that for some $\delta > 0$ if (G, x, y) is edge rooted then $c(G, x, y) \geq \delta$. The weighted number of closed walks of length $2k$ in (T, x) is defined as

$$W_{2k}(T, x, c) = \sum_{w \in W_{2k}(T, x)} \prod_{i=1}^{2k} c(T, e_i).$$

We will write $c(G, x, y)$ as $c(x, y)$ when there is no confusion. Define the symmetrized weight function $\kappa(x, y) = c(x, y)c(y, x)$. Note that if w is a closed walk on a tree then for every forward step e_i of w there is a unique accompanying step e_j in the reverse direction to e_i at some time $j > i$. Pairing up every forward

step with its accompanying reversal we see that

$$W_{2k}(T,x,c) = \sum_{w \in W_{2k}(T,x)} \prod_{i \,\text{forward time of}\, w} \kappa(e_i).$$

Let $\mathrm{Dyck}(k)$ denote the set of all Dyck paths of length $2k$, which are the set of all possible height profiles of walks in $W_{2k}(T,x)$. For a neighbour y of x, let $W_{2k}(T,x,y,h,c)$ be the weighted sum over all walks in $W_{2k}(T,x)$ whose first step is towards y and which has height profile h, expect without accounting for the first weighted step:

$$W_{2k}(T,x,y,h,c) = \sum_{\substack{w \in W_{2k}(T,x) \\ w_1 = y,\, h_w = h}} \prod_{\substack{\text{forward times}\, i, \\ i>1}} \kappa(e_i).$$

Conditioning on the height profile and the first step of walks gives

$$W_{2k}(T,x,c) = \sum_{h \in \mathrm{Dyck}(k)} \sum_{y : y \sim x} \kappa(x,y) W_{2k}(T,x,y,h,c). \tag{3.1}$$

Let $(T,\circ)$ be a unimodular tree with finite expected degree. Recall the edge rooted tree $(T,\circ,\circ')$ derived from $(T,\circ)$ via (2.1). Jensen's inequality gives $\mathbb{E}\left[W_{2k}(T,\circ,\circ',h,c)\right] \geq \exp\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\log W_{2k}(T,\circ,\circ',h,c)\right]\right\}$. Since $\kappa(G,x,y) \geq \delta^2$ for every edge rooted graph (G,x,y) we conclude from (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[W_{2k}(T,\circ,c)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} &= \sum_{h \in \mathrm{Dyck}(k)} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(\circ,\circ') W_{2k}(T,\circ,\circ',h,c)\right] \\ &\geq \delta^2 \sum_{h \in \mathrm{Dyck}(k)} \exp\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\log W_{2k}(T,\circ,\circ',h,c)\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Let $(T,x,y) \in \mathcal{G}^{**}$ be an edge rooted tree with no leaves and $h \in \mathrm{Dyck}(k)$. We define a probability distribution on the set $\{w \in W_{2k}(T,x) : w_1 = y, h_w = h\}$. Note that any element of this set is encoded as a sequence of edge rooted trees $(T_1,e_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},e_{2k})$, where $(T_1,e_1) = (T,x,y)$ and (T_i,e_i) is obtained from (T_{i-1},e_{i-1}) by moving along the i-th edge of the walk. Therefore, consider the following probability distribution $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})$ on the set. First, $(T_1,f_1) = (T,x,y)$. Now consider a stack S of forward times of h that is initialized to $S = [1]$. For $i > 1$, if i is a forward time then set $(T_i,f_i) = \mathrm{NBW}(T_{i-1},f_{i-1})$ and append i to S by updating $S = [S,i]$. If i is a backward time, let ℓ be the last element of S and set $(T_i,f_i) = (T_\ell, \overleftarrow{f}_\ell)$, which is the reversal of graph at time ℓ. Then update S by removing ℓ from the end of S. Observe that the walk is at the root whenever S in empty and then the next step is a forward step. The stack S is determined from h and non random. Note that at a forward time i, (T_i,f_i) is conditionally independent of $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{i-2},f_{i-2})$ given (T_{i-1},f_{i-1}) due to the Markov property of the NBW. However, during a backward time i, (T_i,f_i) is measurable with respect to $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{i-1},f_{i-1})$.

Lemma 5. *Let (T,x,y), h and $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})$ be as above. Then,*

$$\log W_{2k}(T,x,y,h,c) \geq \sum_{\substack{\textit{forward times}\, i, \\ i>1}} H\left[(T_i,f_i) \,|\, (T_{i-1},f_{i-1})\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\log \kappa(T_i,f_i)\right].$$

Proof. For two probability distributions of a countable set Ω with densities p and q, the Kullback-Liebler Divergence of p from q is $D(p||q) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \log\left(\frac{p(\omega)}{q(\omega)}\right) p(\omega)$. The divergence is non negative, which gives

$\sum -\log(q(\omega))p(\omega) \geq \sum -\log(p(\omega))p(\omega)$. If q has the form $q(\omega) = e^{E(\omega)}/Z$, then we get $\log Z \geq H[X] + \mathbb{E}[E(X)]$, where X has probability density p.

We apply this for $\Omega = \{w \in W_{2k}(T,x) : w_1 = y, h_w = h\}$, X being the process $(T_1, f_1), \ldots, (T_{2k}, f_{2k})$, and $E(w) = \sum_{\text{forward time } i>1} \log \kappa(e_i)$ for a walk $w \in \Omega$. We deduce that

$$\log W_{2k}(T,x,y,h,c) \geq H\left[(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})\right] + \sum_{\substack{\text{forward times } i,\\ i>1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\log \kappa(T_i,f_i)\right].$$

We use the chain rule to calculate $H[(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})]$. Note that $H[(T_1,f_1)] = 0$ since (T_1,f_1) is non random. Therefore,

$$H\left[(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})\right] = \sum_{i=2}^{2k} H\left[(T_i,f_i) \mid (T_{i-1},f_{i-1}),\ldots,(T_1,f_1)\right].$$

During a backward time i, $H[(T_i,f_i) \mid (T_{i-1},f_{i-1})\ldots(T_1,f_1)] = 0$ because (T_i,f_i) is determined from $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{i-1},f_{i-1})$ and the stack S. At a forward time $i > 1$, the conditional independence of (T_i,f_i) from $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{i-2},f_{i-2})$ given (T_{i-1},f_{i-1}) implies

$$H[(T_i,f_i) \mid (T_{i-1},f_{i-1}),\ldots,(T_1,f_1)] = H[(T_i,f_i) \mid (T_{i-1},f_{i-1})].$$

Therefore,

$$H\left[(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})\right] = \sum_{\substack{i \text{ forward time}\\ i>1}} H[(T_i,f_i) \mid (T_{i-1},f_{i-1})].$$

□

Let $(T_1,\circ_1,\circ_1'),\ldots,(T_{2k},\circ_{2k},\circ_{2k}')$ be the law of the process $(T_1,f_1),\ldots,(T_{2k},f_{2k})$ started from the random edge rooted graph $(T,\circ,\circ')$. Applying Lemma 5 to $(T,\circ,\circ')$ and taking expectation over $(T,\circ,\circ')$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\log W_{2k}(T,\circ,\circ',h,c)\right] \geq \sum_{\substack{\text{forward times } i,\\ i>1}} H\left[(T_i,\circ_i,\circ_i') \,|\, (T_{i-1},\circ_{i-1},\circ_{i-1}')\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\log \kappa(T_i,\circ_i,\circ_i')\right].$$

We claim that every $(T_i,\circ_i,\circ_i')$ has the law of $(T,\circ,\circ')$. This is certainly the case for $i = 1$. Assume that this is the case for each of the graphs $(T_1,\circ_1,\circ_1'),\ldots,(T_{i-1},\circ_{i-1},\circ_{i-1}')$. Then $(T_i,\circ_i,\circ_i')$ has the law of either the graph $\mathrm{NBW}(T_{i-1},\circ_{i-1},\circ_{i-1}')$ or the reversal of one of the graphs $(T_1,\circ_1,\circ_1'),\ldots,(T_{i-1},\circ_{i-1},\circ_{i-1}')$. By Lemma 4 both these operations preserve the law of $(T,\circ,\circ')$. So the claim follows from induction. Consequently, for every i we have

$$H[(T_i,\circ_i,\circ_i')|(T_{i-1},\circ_{i-1},\circ_{i-1}')] = H[\mathrm{NBW}((T,\circ,\circ'))|(T,\circ,\circ')] \text{ and } \mathbb{E}\left[\log \kappa(T_i,\circ_i,\circ_i')\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(T,\circ,\circ')\right].$$

As there are $k-1$ forward times $i > 1$, we combine the inequality above along with (3.2) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[W_{2k}(T,\circ,c)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} &\geq \delta^2 \sum_{h \in \mathrm{Dyck}(k)} \exp\Big\{(k-1)\,H[\mathrm{NBW}(T,\circ,\circ') \mid (T,\circ,\circ')] + (k-1)\,\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(T,\circ,\circ')\right]\Big\}\\ &= \delta^2 \left|\mathrm{Dyck}(k)\right| \exp\Big\{(k-1)H\left[\mathrm{NBW}(T,\circ,\circ') \mid (T,\circ,\circ')\right] + (k-1)\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa(T,\circ,\circ')\right]\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

The number of Dyck paths of length $2k$ is the Catalan number $\frac{1}{k+1}\binom{2k}{k}$. Then it is easily seen that $|\mathrm{Dyck}(k)|^{1/2k} \to 2$ as $k \to \infty$. The edge reversal invariance of $(T, \circ, \circ')$ also implies that $\mathbb{E}[\log \kappa(T, \circ, \circ')] = 2\mathbb{E}[\log c(T, \circ, \circ')]$. Therefore, we conclude from the inequality above that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T, \circ, c)|\right]^{1/2k} \geq 2 \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2} H[\mathrm{NBW}(T, \circ, \circ') \mid (T, \circ, \circ')] + \mathbb{E}[\log c(T, \circ, \circ')]\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Plugging the expression for $H[\mathrm{NBW}(T, \circ, \circ') \mid (T, \circ, \circ')]$ from (2.3) and then letting $c(G, x, y) \equiv 1$ in (3.3) provides the first stated lower bound to $\rho(T)$ from Theorem 1. If $(T, \circ)$ has degrees bounded by Δ almost surely then the first stated lower bound to $\rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T)$ follows by setting $c(G, x, y) = 1/\deg_G(x)$ and $\delta = 1/\Delta$.

The second group of lower bounds in Theorem 1 are derived from convexity. Jensen's inequality applied to $x \to x \log(x-1)$ for $x \geq 2$ gives $\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ) \log(\deg(\circ) - 1)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)] \log(\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)] - 1)$, which provides the second stated lower bound to $\rho(T)$. Jensen's applied to $x \to e^x$ for the probability measure $f \to \mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ) f] / \mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]$ gives

$$\exp\left\{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ) \log \deg(\circ)]}{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]}\right\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)^2\right]}{\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)]}.$$

Taking reciprocals of this inequality and then combining it with the bound $\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ) \log(\deg(\circ) - 1)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)] \log(\mathbb{E}[\deg(\circ)] - 1)$ provides the second stated lower bound to $\rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T)$.

4 Alon-Boppana bound for bounded degree graphs

Proof of part I of Theorem 2 From the assumption that $(G_n, \circ) \to (G, \circ)$ we have that the universal cover trees $(T_{G_n}, \circ)$ of $(G_n, \circ)$ converges to $(T_G, \circ)$. Indeed, the finite size neighborhoods of the universal cover of a graph is derived from the finite sized neighbourhoods of the graph itself. In particular, $\mu_{T_{G_n}} \to \mu_{T_G}$ weakly and since $\sup_n \rho(T_{G_n}) \leq \sup_n \rho(G_n) < \infty$ we have $\mathbb{E}[|W_{2k}(T_{G_n}, \circ)|] \to \mathbb{E}[|W_{2k}(T_G, \circ)|]$ for every k.

Lemma 6. *Let $(H, \circ)$ be a unimodular network with $\rho(H) < \infty$. For $0 < a < \rho(T_H)$ and any $k \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mu_H(\{|x| > a\}) \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[|W_{2k}(T_H, \circ)|] - a^{2k}}{\rho(H)^{2k}}.$$

Proof. Let $\nu = \mu_H(\{|x| > a\})$. The moments of the spectral measure of $(H, \circ)$ satisfy

$$\int x^{2k}\, d\mu_H = \mathbb{E}[|W_{2k}(H, \circ)|] \geq \mathbb{E}[|W_{2k}(T_H, \circ)|].$$

On the other hand, we may bound the moments from above as follows. Note that $\mu_H(\{|x| > \rho(H)\}) = 0$ by definition of the spectral radius. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int x^{2k}\, d\mu_H &= \int_{|x|\leq a} x^{2k}\, d\mu_H + \int_{|x|>a} x^{2k}\, d\mu_H \\
&\leq a^{2k}\, \mu_H(\{|x| \leq a\}) + \rho(H)^{2k}\, \mu_H(\{|x| > a\}) \\
&= a^{2k} + \nu\left(\rho(H)^{2k} - a^{2k}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the lower and upper bounds on the moments we get that for every k,

$$\nu \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_H,\circ)|\right] - a^{2k}}{\rho(H)^{2k} - a^{2k}} \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_H,\circ)|\right] - a^{2k}}{\rho(H)^{2k}}.$$

□

Since $\mu_{T_{G_n}} \to \mu_{T_G}$ weakly, Fatou's Lemma implies that $\rho(T_G) \leq \liminf_n \rho(T_{G_n})$. Thus, for $0 < \epsilon < \rho(T_G)$ we have $\rho(T_G) - \epsilon < \rho(T_{G_n})$ for all sufficiently large n. Writing $\epsilon = \delta\rho(T_G)$ and recalling that $\Delta = \sup_n \rho(G_n)$, Lemma 6 implies that for any k we have that for all large n,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{G_n}\left(\{|x| > \rho(T_G) - \epsilon\}\right) &\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_{G_n},\circ)|\right] - (\rho(T_G)-\epsilon)^{2k}}{\rho(G_n)^{2k}} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_{G_n},\circ)|\right] - ((1-\delta)\rho(T_G))^{2k}}{\Delta^{2k}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_{G_n},\circ)|\right] \to \mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_G,\circ)|\right]$ we conclude that

$$\liminf_n \ \mu_{G_n}\left(\{|x| > \rho(T_G) - \epsilon\}\right) \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_G,\circ)|\right] - ((1-\delta)\rho(T_G))^{2k}}{\Delta^{2k}} \ \text{ for every } \ k.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(T_G,\circ)|\right]^{1/2k} \to \rho(T_G)$ as $k \to \infty$ we may choose K such that $\rho(T_G)^{-2K}\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2K}(T_G,\circ)|\right] \geq (1-\frac{\delta}{2})^{2K}$. Then, defining

$$c(\epsilon,\Delta,\mu_{T_G}) = \frac{(1-\delta/2)^{2K} - (1-\delta)^{2K}}{(\Delta/\rho(T_G))^{2K}},$$

the inequality above applied to $k = K$ implies that $\liminf_n \mu_{G_n}(\{|x| > \rho(T_G) - \epsilon\}) \geq c(\epsilon,\Delta,\mu_{T_G})$. This completes the proof of part I of Theorem 2.

Proof of part II of Theorem 2 The following lemma will be used in the proof of part II.

Lemma 7. *Let G be a finite connected graph. Let G^{core} be the maximal induced subgraph of G with no leaves. If G is not a tree then $d_{\text{av}}(G^{\text{core}}) \geq d_{\text{av}}(G)$. Moreover, $\sigma_j(G) \geq \sigma_j(G^{\text{core}})$, where $\sigma_j(H) = 0$ by convention if $j > |H|$. (Recall $\sigma_j(H)$ is the j-th largest eigenvalue of H in absolute value counted with multiplicity).*

Proof. Since G is not a tree, $|E(G)| \geq |G|$. If G' is obtained from G by removing a leaf then $d_{\text{av}}(G') = 2(|E(G)|-1)/(|G|-1) \geq d_{\text{av}}(G)$ since $|E(G)| \geq |G|$. Moreover, the adjacency matrix of G' is a principal minor of the adjacency matrix of G. Suppose $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$ are the $n = |G|$ eigenvalues of G, and $\nu_1 \geq \nu_2 \geq \cdots \geq \nu_{n-1}$ are the eigenvalues of G'. From the Cauchy Interlacing Theorem we have $\lambda_1 \geq \nu_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \nu_2 \geq \cdots \geq \nu_{n-1} \geq \lambda_n$. This implies that $\sigma_j(G) \geq \sigma_j(G')$ for every j.

The graph G^{core} is obtained by iteratively removing leaves from G until a subgraph with no leaves remains. Therefore, the observations above imply $d_{\text{av}}(G^{\text{core}}) \geq d_{\text{av}}(G)$ and $\sigma_j(G) \geq \sigma_j(G^{\text{core}})$. □

We now prove part II of the theorem. Let G_{n_i} be a subsequence such that $\liminf_n \sigma_j(G_n) = \lim_i \sigma_j(G_{n_i})$. Clearly, $\liminf_i 2\sqrt{d\text{av}(G_{n_i}) - 1} \geq \liminf_n 2\sqrt{d\text{av}(G_n) - 1}$. Therefore, we may reduce to the subsequence of graphs G_{n_i} and show that $\liminf_i \sigma_j(G_{n_i}) \geq \liminf_i 2\sqrt{d\text{av}(G_{n_i}) - 1}$. Henceforth, we denote $\sigma_j = \lim_i \sigma_j(G_{n_i})$ and the subsequence G_{n_i} as G_n.

Suppose it is the case that for an infinite subsequence G_{n_i} of G_n we have that $|G_{n_i}^{\text{core}}| \to \infty$. It suffices to show that $\sigma_j \geq \liminf_i 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(G_{n_i}) - 1}$ because the latter is a lower bound to $\liminf_n 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(G_n) - 1}$. Let us denote the subsequence G_{n_i} as H_n. We have that $|H_n^{\text{core}}| \to \infty$.

The sequence of graphs H_n^{core} are connected, have no leaves, have maximum degree at most Δ and $|H_n^{\text{core}}| \to \infty$. If $\circ_n$ is a random root of H_n^{core} then the unimodular networks $(H_n^{\text{core}}, \circ_n)$ have a subsequential limit $(G, \circ)$. Indeed, the subset of $\mathcal{G}^*$ consisting of rooted isomorphism classes of graphs of maximal degree Δ is compact because there are at most Δ^r possibilities for the r-neighbourhood of the root of such graphs. Prokhorov's Theorem states that probability distributions on a compact metric space is compact in the weak topology. This provides a subsequential limit of $(H_n^{\text{core}}, \circ_n)$ in the local weak topology.

After reducing to a convergent subsequence we may assume that $(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}, \circ_{n_i}) \to (G, \circ)$. Let $(T, \circ)$ be the universal cover of $(G, \circ)$; $(T, \circ)$ has no leaves and maximum degree at most Δ almost surely because $(G, \circ)$ inherits these properties from $H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}$. Part I of the theorem implies $\liminf_i \mu_{H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}}(\{|x| > \rho(T) - \epsilon\}) > 0$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Since $|H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}| \to \infty$ we have that for all large i, $\sigma_j(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}) \geq \rho(T) - \epsilon$. From Theorem 1 we have $\rho(T) \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right] - 1} = \lim_i 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}) - 1}$. Therefore, since ϵ is arbitrary we get

$$\liminf_i \sigma_j(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}) \geq \liminf_i 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}) - 1}\,.$$

Lemma 7 implies $\sigma_j(H_{n_i}) \geq \sigma_j(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}})$, and therefore, $\sigma_j \geq \liminf_i \sigma_j(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}})$ because H_{n_i} being a subsequence of G_n implies $\sigma_j = \liminf_i \sigma_j(H_{n_i})$. Moreover, Lemma 7 also implies $2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}) - 1} \geq 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(H_{n_i}) - 1}$. This gives that $\liminf_i 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(H_{n_i}^{\text{core}}) - 1} \geq \liminf_n 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(G_n) - 1}$ since H_{n_i} is a subsequence of G_n. Part II of the theorem follows from combining these two bounds on σ_j and the average degree with the inequality above.

We are left to consider the case where the core graphs of the sequence G_n have bounded size, possibly being empty. Due to compactness the unimodular networks $(G_n, \circ_n)$, where $\circ_n$ is a random root of G_n, have a subsequential limit $(G, \circ)$. We claim that $(G, \circ)$ is an infinite unimodular tree of expected degree 2. Indeed, $(G, \circ)$ is infinite almost surely because G_n is connected and $|G_n| \to \infty$. To see that $(G, \circ)$ is a tree observe that the graph induced on $G_n \setminus G_n^{\text{core}}$ contains no cycles. Then $B_r(G_n, \circ_n)$ is a tree so long as $\circ_n$ is not within distance r of G_n^{core}, and this happens with probability at least $1 - \frac{|G_n^{\text{core}}|\Delta^r}{|G_n|} \to 1$. This implies that the finite neighbourhood sampling statistics of $(G, \circ)$ are supported on trees and thus $(G, \circ)$ is a tree. Finally, suppose l_n is the number of vertices removed from G_n during the leaf peeling procedure that generates G_n^{core}. Then $|G_n| = |G_n^{\text{core}}| + l_n$, $|E(G_n)| = |E(G_n^{\text{core}})| + l_n$, and $l_n \to \infty$ because $|G_n^{\text{core}}|$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore,

$$d_{\text{av}}(G_n) = 2\,\frac{|E(G_n^{\text{core}})| + l_n}{|G_n^{\text{core}}| + l_n} \to 2,$$

which shows that $(G, \circ)$ has expected degree 2.

Now we claim that $\rho(G) \geq 2$. As $(G, \circ)$ is infinite there is an infinite one ended path starting from $\circ$. Therefore, $|W_{2k}(G, \circ)|$ is at least the number of closed walks of length $2k$ on an infinite one ended path starting from the initial leaf vertex. This quantity is the Catalan number $C_k = \frac{1}{k+1}\binom{2k}{k}$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}\left[|W_{2k}(G, \circ)|\right] \geq C_k$ and we conclude that $\rho(G) \geq 2$ because $C_k^{1/2k} \to 2$.

The tree $(G, \circ)$ is its own universal cover. Using part I of the theorem and arguing as before we deduce that $\liminf_n \sigma_j(G_n) \geq 2$. On the other hand, $\liminf_n 2\sqrt{d_{\text{av}}(G_n) - 1} \leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{(G,\circ)}[\deg(\circ)] - 1} = 2$. These bounds complete the proof of the theorem in the case that the core subgraphs are of bounded size.

Proof of part III of Theorem 2 This is very similar to the proof of part II and simpler due to the assumption that the graphs G_n have no leaves. We outline the argument for brevity. For a finite graph G let us denote

$$\bar{D}(G) = \frac{2d_{\mathrm{av}}(G)\sqrt{d_{\mathrm{av}}(G)-1}}{\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{x\in G}(\deg x)^2}.$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$ consider a subsequence G_{n_i} such that $\lim_i \mu^{\mathrm{SRW}}_{G_{n_i}}(\{|x| > \bar{D}(G_{n_i}) - \epsilon\}) = \liminf_n \mu^{\mathrm{SRW}}_{G_n}(\{|x| > \bar{D}(G_n) - \epsilon\})$. Due to compactness there is a further convergent subsequence $(G_{n_{i_j}}, \circ_{n_{i_j}}) \to (G, \circ)$ in the local weak topology. It suffices to prove the claim for this convergent subsequence.

Denote the sequence of graphs $G_{n_{i_j}}$ as H_n. Arguing as in the proof of part I we have that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mu^{\mathrm{SRW}}_{H_n}\left(\left\{|x| > \rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T_G) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) > 0.$$

Theorem 1 applied to the universal cover T_G of the limit $(G, \circ)$ above implies

$$\rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T_G) \geq \bar{D}(G, \circ) =: \frac{2\,\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]-1}}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)^2\right]}.$$

Observe that $\bar{D}(H_n) \to \bar{D}(G, \circ)$ due to $(H_n, \circ_n)$ converging to $(G, \circ)$ and all the graphs being of bounded degree. Thus, for sufficiently large n we have $\bar{D}(G, \circ) \geq \bar{D}(H_n) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Then for such n we have

$$\mu^{\mathrm{SRW}}_{H_n}(\{|x| > \bar{D}(H_n) - \epsilon\}) \geq \mu^{\mathrm{SRW}}_{H_n}(\{|x| > \rho_{\mathrm{SRW}}(T_G) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\}).$$

This implies the required claim for the sequence of graph H_n and completes the proof of part III.

5 Volume growth in unimodular trees

For an infinite, connected and locally finite graph G the volume growth rate of G is the exponential growth rate of balls centered at any vertex: $\liminf_{r\to\infty} |B_r(G, x)|^{1/r}$. This quantity does not depend on the choice of vertex. The volume growth of a unimodular network $(G, \circ)$ is the expected growth rate of balls around the root: $\mathrm{gr}(G) = \liminf_r \mathbb{E}\left[|B_r(G, \circ)|\right]^{1/r}$.

Let $(T, \circ)$ be a unimodular tree with $\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right] < \infty$ and having no leaves almost surely. Let $S_r(T, x) = \{v \in V(T) : \mathrm{dist}_T(x, v) = r\}$, and $S_r(T, x, y)$ denote the set of vertices v in $S_r(T, x)$ such that the unique path from x to v goes through y during the first step. Therefore, $|S_r(T, x)| = \sum_{y\sim x} |S_r(T, x, y)|$. Recall the definition of the edge rooted graph $(T, \circ, \circ')$ derived from $(T, \circ)$ via (2.1). We have,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|S_r(T, \circ)|\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} = \mathbb{E}\left[|S_r(T, \circ, \circ')|\right] \geq \exp\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\log|S_r(T, \circ, \circ')|\right]\right\}.$$

The quantity $\log|S_r(T, \circ, \circ')|$ is the entropy of the uniform distribution on $S_r(T, \circ, \circ')$, provided that $(T, \circ, \circ')$ is fixed. We bound it from below by the entropy of a particular distribution supported on $S_r(T, \circ, \circ')$ that we describe in the following. First, observe that an element of $S(T, x, y)$ in uniquely determined by a sequence of directed edges $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ of T such that $e_1 = (x, y)$, $e_i^- = e_{i-1}^+$ and $e_i \neq \overleftarrow{e}_{i-1}$. We consider a distribution on $S_r(T, \circ, \circ')$ by defining a random sequence of directed edges $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ of T with these properties. First, set $f_1 = (\circ, \circ')$, and then for $2 \leq i \leq r$ let f_i be a NBW step from the edge f_{i-1}. In other

words, we consider the NBW on $(T, \circ, \circ')$ up to time r.

Let $H[f_2, \ldots, f_r \mid f_1]$ be the entropy of the process $f_2, \ldots, f_r$ with the outcome of $(T, f_1) = (T, \circ, \circ')$ assumed fixed. Although the NBW is a process on edge rooted graphs we avoid writing pairs (T_i, f_i) for convenience. We have $\log |S_r(T, \circ, \circ')| \geq H[f_2, \ldots, f_r \mid f_1]$. From the chain rule of entropy we get

$$H[f_2, \ldots, f_r \mid f_1] = \sum_{i=2}^{r} H[f_i \mid f_{i-1}, \ldots, f_1].$$

The Markov property of the NBW implies that $H[f_i \mid f_{i-1}, \ldots, f_1] = H[f_i \mid f_{i-1}, f_1]$, where the expectation in the latter entropy is over the law of (T_{i-1}, f_{i-1}) conditional of the fixed outcome of (T_1, f_1). Taking expectation over (T_1, f_1) then gives $\mathbb{E}\left[H[f_i \mid f_{i-1}, f_1]\right] = H[f_i | f_{i-1}]$, where the expectation for the latter entropy is over the unconditional law of (T_{i-1}, f_{i-1}). From the stationary of the NBW in Lemma 4 we see that (T_{i-1}, f_{i-1}) has the law of $(T, \circ, \circ')$ for every i. From the expression for the NBW entropy of a unimodular network in (2.3) we then see that

$$H[f_i | f_{i-1}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\, \log(\deg(\circ) - 1)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} \text{ for every } i.$$

Putting everything together we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[|S_r(T, \circ)|\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]} &\geq \exp\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\log |S_r(T, \circ, \circ')|\right]\right\} \\
&\geq \exp\left\{\sum_{i=2}^{r} H[f_i | f_{i-1}]\right\} \\
&= \exp\left\{(r-1)\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\, \log(\deg(\circ) - 1)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right]}\right\} \\
&\geq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\deg(\circ)\right] - 1\right)^{r-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is from applying Jensen's inequality to $x \to x \log(x-1)$ for $x \geq 2$.

6 Future directions

In an extensive study of d-regular unimodular networks Abért et. al. [1] show that if an infinite d-regular unimodular network has spectral radius $2\sqrt{d-1}$ then if must be the d-regular tree. They also prove that if a sequence of finite, connected d-regular graphs G_n converges to the d-regular tree in the local weak limit then apart from $o(|G_n|)$ short cycles the smallest cycle in G_n has length of order at least $\log \log |G_n|$. Little is known about these kind of spectral rigidity results for arbitrary unimodular networks. Suppose a sequence of finite connected graphs G_n of growing size share a common universal cover T. If the spectral measures of the G_n concentrate on $[-\rho(T), \rho(T)]$ as $n \to \infty$ then does G_n converge to T in the local weak limit?

References

[1] M. Abért, Y. Glasner, and B. Virág. The measurable Kesten theorem. *Annals of Probability*, 44(3):1601–1646, 2016.

[2] D. Aldous and R. Lyons. Processes on unimodular networks. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 12(54):1454–1508, 2007.

[3] O. Angel, J. Friedman, and S. Hoory. The non-backtracking spectrum of the universal cover of a graph. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 367:4287–4318, 2015.

[4] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm. Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 6(23), 2001.

[5] C. Bordenave. Spectrum of random graphs. Available at `http://www.math.univ-toulouse.fr/~bordenave/coursSRG.pdf`, 2016.

[6] S. M. Cioabă. Eigenvalues of graphs and a simple proof of a theorem of Greenberg. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 416:776–782, 2006.

[7] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006.

[8] G. Elek. Weak convergence of finite graphs, integrated density of states and a cheeger type inequality. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 98(1):62–68, 2008.

[9] Y. Greenberg. *On the Spectrum of Graphs and Their Universal Covering*. PhD thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995. (In Hebrew)

[10] S. Hoory. A lower bound on the spectral radius of the universal cover of a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 93:63–73, 2005.

[11] F. Leighton. Finite common coverings of graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 33:231–238, 1982.

[12] A. Lubotzky. Cayley graphs: eigenvalues, expanders and random walks. In *Survey in Combinatorics*, pages 155 – 189. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[13] B. Mohar. A strengthening and a multipartite generalization of the Alon-Boppana-Serre Theorem. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 138:3899–3909, 2010.

[14] A. Nilli. On the second eigenvalue of a graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 91:207–210, 1991.

[15] J.-P. Serre. Répartition asymptotique des valeurs propres de l'opérateur de Hecke T_p. *Journal of the Americal Mathematical Society*, 10(1):75–102, 1997.

Mustazee Rahman, Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
E-mail: `mustazee@mit.edu` Web: `www.math.mit.edu/~mustazee`